



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,580	01/21/2004	Michael I. Chia	DP-309337	2605

7590 11/07/2006

STEFAN V. CHMIELEWISKI
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Staff MC CT10C
P.O. Box 9005
Kokomo, IN 46904-9005

EXAMINER

BROADHEAD, BRIAN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/761,580

Applicant(s)

CHIA, MICHAEL I.

Examiner

Brian J. Broadhead

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6-15-06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: The limitation of "determining when the sensed rate between successive measurements reflects.... simultaneously, the sensed range rate between successive measurements reflects...", seem to be reciting the same measurement going in two different directions at the same time. The specification isn't clear on how range rate is determined and only discloses measuring time of reflection of different types of wave off the target vehicle. Is the applicant implying Doppler radar is being used to measure range rate? This needs to be clearer because otherwise the measure of range rate by reflected waves is going to be by differentiating the different successive ranges measured. This would result in the claim resulting in two opposite results for the exact same value. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 through 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims now all recite that the range is

downwardly adjusted after it is determined that initial range is less than the current range and the range rate is above a predetermined rate. This is not how the invention is disclosed in the specification or the drawings. The specification repeatedly discloses the invention adding to the range when the range rate is above a predetermined rate (see paragraphs 16, 17, and 19). In this upward adjustment the value of the initial and current range is not used (see figure 3). Since the claims are now not claiming the invention as disclosed the prior art rejections are still going to be based on the inventive idea claimed in the original claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gilling et al. (US005749426A).

6. Per claims 1 and 22, Gilling teaches a method for providing close range detection for a motor vehicle including determining an initial range and range rate (column 3, lines 28- 32), determining whether the initial range to the target is less than a current range to the target when the range rate to the target is not above the predetermined rate and providing an adjusted range when the initial range to the target is less than the current range to the target and the range rate is below the predetermined rate (column 6, lines 31-55), wherein the adjusted range is utilized to control operation of the motor vehicle.

Art Unit: 3661

7. Per claims 2-4, Gilling teaches adding a predetermined offset to the adjusted range when the range rate is above a predetermined rate (column 5, lines 11-51).
8. Per claim 5, Gilling teaches that the purpose of the adjusted range is to maintain a separation distance when the vehicle range rate becomes 0.0 m/s, i.e. when the vehicle stops.
9. Per claims 7 and 8, Gilling teaches that the operation of the vehicle is controlled by the throttle and brake systems (column 6, lines 8-12).
10. Per claim 9, Gilling teaches a system for providing close range detection for a motor vehicle including a range sensor (1, figure 1) and a subsystem for determining an initial range and range rate (column 3, lines 28-32), determining whether the initial range to the target is less than a current range to the target when the range rate to the target is not above the predetermined rate and providing an adjusted range when the initial range to the target is less than the current range to the target and the range rate is below the predetermined rate (column 6, lines 31-55), wherein the adjusted range is utilized to control operation of the motor vehicle.
11. Per claims 10-12, Gilling teaches adding a predetermined offset to the adjusted range when the range rate is above a predetermined rate (column 5, lines 11-51).
12. Per claim 13, Gilling teaches that the purpose of the adjusted range is to maintain a separation distance when the vehicle range rate becomes 0.0 m/s, i.e. when the vehicle stops, which is "about" .5 m/s.
13. Per claims 15 and 16, Gilling teaches that the operation of the vehicle is controlled by the throttle and brake systems (column 6, lines 8-12).

14. Per claim 17, Gilling teaches a system for providing close range detection for a motor vehicle including a range sensor (1, figure 1) and a subsystem for determining an initial range and range rate (column 3, lines 28-32), determining whether the initial range to the target is less than a current range to the target when the range rate to the target is not above the predetermined rate and providing an adjusted range when the initial range to the target is less than the current range to the target and the range rate is below the predetermined rate (column 6, lines 31-55), wherein the adjusted range is utilized to control operation of the motor vehicle, and adding a predetermined offset to the adjusted range (column 5, lines 11-51), and also including a throttle subsystem (16, figure 1).

15. Per claim 18, Gilling teaches adding a predetermined offset to the adjusted range- when the range rate is above a predetermined rate (column 5, lines 11-51).

16. Per claim 19, Gilling teaches that the purpose of the adjusted range is to maintain a separation distance when the vehicle range rate becomes 0.0 m/s, i.e. when the vehicle stops, which is "about" .5 m/s.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 6, 14, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilling in view of Labuhn et al. (US006622810B2).

Art Unit: 3661

19. Per claims 6, 14, and 20, Gilling teaches the invention as explained in the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 17. Gilling does not teach an alarm when the vehicle approaches too close to the preceding vehicle. Such a capability would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. An alarm serves the purpose of alerting the driver that the vehicle has become dangerously close to the vehicle in front. Even in systems where the vehicle initiates braking, it is still beneficial to warn and alert the driver in order to ensure safety and reduce the chances of a collision. Labuhn is exemplary of the fact that this alarm capability was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (see column 5, lines 28-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to provide an alarm to warn the driver that the vehicle is too close to the preceding vehicle, in order to alert the driver and decrease the risk of a collision.

20. Per claim 21, Gilling teaches a brake subsystem (17, figure 1).

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 3-6-06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The amendments to the claims now fail to claim the invention as disclosed. The examiner is assuming that this was not intentional and resulted from confusion. The previous prior art rejections are maintained since they are closer to the disclosed invention and what the examiner believes is trying to be claimed.

Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Broadhead whose telephone number is 571-272-6957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on 571-272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


BJB


THOMAS BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER